

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/550,079 | 09/19/2005 | Shigeru Ogawa | 52433/816 | 1575 | |
| 26646 KENYON & K | 7590 11/23/200 XENYON LLP | EXAMINER | | | |
| ONE BROADWAY | | | SUHOL, DMITRY | | |
| NEW YORK, NY 10004 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3725 | | |
| | | | | ·· | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | • | | 11/23/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|-----------------|--------------|
| 10/550,079 | OGAWA ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit |
| Dmitry Suhol | 3725 |

| | Dmitry Suhol | 3725 | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 30 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c | idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) | | | | |
| | a) The period for reply expires <u>3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</u> | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejecti | on. | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | | | | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | | | | | |
| 3. A The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, | but prior to the date of filing a brief | will not be entered by | ecalise | | | | |
| (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co | nsideration and/or search (see NO | TE below): | ccause | | | | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | | , , | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally reio | ected claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. | ` '' | mpliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | | , | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | timely filed amendme | ent canceling the | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>3 and 6</u> . | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome all rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fai | ls to provide a | | | | |
| 0. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. | | | | | | | |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: | | | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other: | | | | | | | |
| • | | /Dmitry Suhol/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3725 | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly amended claims further define the method step of controlling the roll gap through measurement (by independent load measuring devices) of rolling direction forces acting on the right side and left side of the work rolls and through controlling the roll gap by adjusting the gap so that the difference of the left-right forces approaches zero. Such newly added limitations would require further search and consideration.